

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
PORTLAND DIVISION**

SHEILA HUDSON,

Case No. 3:10-cv-01109-JE

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,
Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

SIMON, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge John Jelderks issued findings and recommendations in the above-captioned case on January 7, 2013. Dkt. No. 15. Judge Jelderks recommended that the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying Plaintiff's application for Disability Income Benefits and Supplemental Social Security Income be affirmed and Plaintiff's suit be dismissed. Neither party filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act ("Act"), the court may "accept, reject or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate's findings and recommendations, "the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If no party objects, the Act does not prescribe a standard of review. In such cases, “[t]here is no indication that Congress . . . intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report[.]” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir.) (*en banc*), *cert. denied*, 540 U.S. 900 (2003) (the court must review *de novo* magistrate’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”). Although review is not required in the absence of objections, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No party having made objections, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Magistrate Judge Jelderks’ findings and recommendations for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Therefore it is hereby ordered that Judge Jelderks’ findings and recommendations, Dkt. No. 15, are ADOPTED.

Dated this 7th day of February, 2013

/s/ Michael H. Simon
 Michael H. Simon
 United States District Judge